arXiv:math-ph/0701046v2 12 Nov 2007

On Universality for Orthogonal Ensembles of Random Matrices

M. Shcherbina
Institute for Low Temperature Physics, Kharkov, Ukraine.
E-mail: shcherbi@ilt.kharkov.ua

Abstract

We prove universality of local eigenvalue statistics in the bulk of the spectrum for orthogonal invariant matrix models with real analytic potentials with one interval limiting spectrum. Our starting point is the Tracy-Widom formula for the matrix reproducing kernel. The key idea of the proof is to represent the differentiation operator matrix written in the basis of orthogonal polynomials as a product of a positive Toeplitz matrix and a two diagonal skew symmetric Toeplitz matrix.

1 Introduction and main result

In this paper we consider ensembles of $n\times n$ real symmetric (or Hermitian) matrices M with the probability distribution

$$P_n(M)dM=Z_{n,\beta}^{-1}\exp\{-\frac{n\beta}{2}\mathrm{Tr}V(M)\}dM, \tag{1.1}$$

where $Z_{n,\beta}$ is the normalization constant, $V:\mathbb{R}\to\mathbb{R}_+$ is a Hölder function satisfying the condition

$$|V(\lambda)|\ge 2(1+\epsilon)\log(1+|\lambda|). \tag{1.2}$$

A positive parameter β here assumes the values $\beta=1$ (in the case of real symmetric matrices) or $\beta=2$ (in the Hermitian case), and dM means the Lebesgue measure on the algebraically independent entries of M. Ensembles of random matrices (1.1) in the real symmetric case are usually called orthogonal, and in the Hermitian case - unitary ensembles. This terminology reflects the fact that the density of (1.1) is invariant with respect to the orthogonal, or unitary transformation of matrices M.

The joint eigenvalue distribution corresponding to (1.1) has the form (see [12])

$$p_{n,\beta}(\lambda_1,...,\lambda_n)=Q_{n,\beta}^{-1}\prod_{i=1}^{n}e^{-n\beta V(\lambda_i)/2}\prod_{1\le j<k\le n}|\lambda_i-\lambda_j|^{\beta}, \tag{1.3}$$

where $Q_{n,\beta}$ is the normalization constant. The simplest question in both cases ($\beta=1,2$) is the behavior of the eigenvalue counting measure (NCM) of the matrix. According to [3, 11] the NCM tends weakly in probability, as $n\to\infty$, to the non random limiting measure $\mathcal{N}$ known as the Integrated Density of States (IDS) of the ensemble, which is one of the main outputs of studies of the global regime. The IDS is normalized to unity and it is absolutely continuous, if V' satisfies the Lipshitz condition [17]. The non-negative density $\rho(\lambda)$ is called the Density of States (DOS) of the ensemble. The IDS can be found as a unique solution of a certain variational problem (see [3, 5, 17]).

Local regimes, or local eigenvalue statistics for unitary ensembles are also well studied now. The problem is to study the behavior of marginal densities

$$p_{l,\beta}^{(n)}(\lambda_1,...,\lambda_l)=\int_{\mathbb{R}^{n-l}}p_{n,\beta}(\lambda_1,...\lambda_l,\lambda_{l+1},...,\lambda_n)d\lambda_{l+1}...d\lambda_n \tag{1.4}$$

in the scaling limit, when $\lambda_i=\lambda_0+s_i/n^\kappa$ $(i=1,\ldots,l)$, and κ is a constant, depending on the behavior of the limiting density $\rho(\lambda)$ in a small neighborhood of λ_0 of the limiting spectrum σ. If $\rho(\lambda_0)\neq 0$, then $\kappa=1$, if $\rho(\lambda_0)=0$ and $\rho(\lambda)\sim|\lambda-\lambda|^\alpha$, then $\kappa=1/(1+\alpha)$. The universality conjecture states that the scaling limits of all marginal densities are universal, i.e. do not depend on V.

In the case of unitary ensembles all marginal densities can be expressed (see [12]) in terms of the unique function $K_{n,2}(\lambda,\mu)$.

$$p_{l,\beta}^{(n)}(\lambda_1,...,\lambda_l)=\frac{(n-l)!}{n!}\det\{K_{n,2}(\lambda_j,\lambda_k)\}_{j,k=1}^l. \tag{1.5}$$

This function has the form

$$K_{n,2}(\lambda,\mu)=\sum_{l=0}^{n-1}\psi_l^{(n)}(\lambda)\psi_l^{(n)}(\mu) \tag{1.6}$$

and is known as a reproducing kernel of the orthonormalized system

$$\psi_l^{(n)}(\lambda)=\exp\{-nV(\lambda)/2\}p_l^{(n)}(\lambda),\ \ l=0,..., \tag{1.7}$$

in which $\{p_l^{(n)}\}_{l=0}^n$ are orthogonal polynomials on $\mathbb{R}$ associated with the weight $w_n(\lambda)=e^{-nV(\lambda)}$ i.e.,

$$\int p_l^{(n)}(\lambda)p_m^{(n)}(\lambda)w_n(\lambda)d\lambda=\delta_{l,m}. \tag{1.8}$$

Hence, the problem to study marginal distributions is replaced by the problem to study the behavior of the reproducing kernel $K_n(\lambda,\mu)$ in the scaling limit.

This problem was solved in many cases. For example, in the bulk case $(\rho(\lambda_0)\neq 0)$ it was shown in [13], that for a general class of V (the third derivative is bounded in the some neighborhood of λ_0)

$$\lim_{n\to\infty}\frac{1}{n\rho(\lambda_0)}K_{n,2}(\lambda_0+s_1/n\rho(\lambda_0),\lambda_0+s_2/n\rho(\lambda_0))=\mathcal{K}_{\infty,2}^{(0)}(s_1,s_2),$$

where $\mathcal{K}_0(s_1,s_2)$ is a universal *sin*-kernel

$$\mathcal{K}_{\infty,2}^{(0)}(s_1-s_2)=\frac{\sin\pi(s_1-s_2)}{\pi(s_1-s_2)}. \tag{1.9}$$

This result for the case of real analytic V was obtained also in [6].

For unitary ensembles it is also possible to study (see [6]) the edge universality, i.e. the case when λ_0 is the edge point of the spectrum and $\rho(\lambda)\sim|\lambda-\lambda_0|^{1/2}$, as $\lambda\sim\lambda_0$. There are also results on the extreme point universality (double scaling limit). This means universality of the limiting kernel in the case when $\rho(\lambda)\sim(\lambda-\lambda_0)^2$, as $\lambda\sim\lambda_0$. See [4] for the result for real analytic potentials and [18] for a general case.

For orthogonal ensembles ($\beta=1$) the situation is more complicated. Instead of (1.6) we have to use 2×2 matrix kernel

$$K_{n,1}(\lambda,\mu)=\begin{pmatrix} S_n(\lambda,\mu) & S_nd(\lambda,\mu)\\ IS_n(\lambda,\mu)-\epsilon(\lambda-\mu) & S_n(\mu,\lambda)\end{pmatrix}. \tag{1.10}$$

Here $S_n(\lambda,\mu)$ is some scalar kernel (see (1.24)) below), d denotes the differentiating, $IS_n(\lambda,\mu)$ can be obtained from S_n by some integration procedure and $\epsilon(\lambda)$ is defined in (1.22). Similarly to the unitary case all marginal densities can be expressed in terms of the kernel K_{n1} (see [21]), e.g.

$$\rho_n(\lambda)=p^{(n)}_{1,1}(\lambda)=\frac{1}{2n}\mathrm{Tr}K_{n,1}(\lambda,\lambda),$$

and

$$p^{(n)}_{2,1}(\lambda,\mu)=\frac{1}{4n(n-1)}\left[\mathrm{Tr}K_{n,1}(\lambda,\lambda)\mathrm{Tr}K_{n,1}(\mu,\mu)-2\mathrm{Tr}\left(K_{n,1}(\lambda,\mu)K_{n,1}(\mu,\lambda)\right)\right].$$

The matrix kernel (1.10) was introduced first in [10] for circular ensemble and then in [12] for orthogonal ensembles. The scalar kernels of (1.10) could be defined in principle in terms of any family of polynomials complete in $L_2(\mathbb{R},w_n)$ (see [21]), but usually the families of skew orthogonal polynomials were used (see [12] and references therein). Unfortunately, for general weights the properties of skew orthogonal polynomials are not studied enough. Hence, using of skew orthogonal polynomials for V of a general type rises serious technical difficulties. In the paper [8] a new approach to this problem was proposed. It is based on the result of [21], which allows to express the kernel $S_n(\lambda,\mu)$ in terms of the family of orthogonal polynomials (1.8). Using the representation of [21], it was shown that $S_n(\lambda,\mu)\to K^{(0)}_{\infty,2}(\lambda,\mu)$, where $K^{(0)}_{\infty,2}(\lambda,\mu)$ is defined by (1.9). The same approach was used in [9] to prove the edge universality. Unfortunately, the papers [8] and [9] deal only with the case, when (in our notations) $V(\lambda)=\lambda^{2m}+n^{-1/2m}a_{2m-2}\lambda^{2m-2}+\dots$. But since, like usually (see [13], [15]), the small terms $n^{-1/2m}a_{2m-2}\lambda^{2m-2}+\dots$ have no influence on the limiting behavior of $K_n(\lambda,\mu)$, this result in fact proves universality for the case of monomial $V(\lambda)=\lambda^{2m}$. In the papers [19, 20] the bulk and the edges universality were studied for the case of V being an even quatric polynomial.

In the present paper we prove universality in the bulk of the spectrum for any real analytic V with one interval support.

Let us state our main conditions.

C1. *$V(\lambda)$ satisfies (1.2) and is an even analytic function in*

$$\Omega[d_1,d_2]=\{z:-2-d_1\le\Re z\le 2+d_1,\ |\Im z|\le d_2\},\quad d_1,d_2>0. \tag{1.11}$$

C2. *The support σ of IDS of the ensemble consists of a single interval:*

$$\sigma=[-2,2].$$

C3. *DOS $\rho(\lambda)$ is strictly positive in the internal points $\lambda\in(-2,2)$ and $\rho(\lambda)\sim|\lambda\mp 2|^{1/2}$, as $\lambda\sim\pm 2$.*

C4. *The function*

$$u(\lambda)=2\int\log|\mu-\lambda|\rho(\mu)d\mu-V(\lambda) \tag{1.12}$$

achieves its maximum if and only if $\lambda\in\sigma$.

It is proved in [2], that under conditions $C1-C4$, if we consider a semi infinite Jacoby matrix $\mathcal{J}^{(n)}$, generated by the recursion relations for the system of orthogonal polynomials (1.8)

$$J^{(n)}_l\psi^{(n)}_{l+1}(\lambda)+q^{(n)}_l\psi^{(n)}_l(\lambda)+J^{(n)}_{l-1}\psi^{(n)}_{l-1}(\lambda)=\lambda\psi^{(n)}_l(\lambda),\quad J^{(n)}_{-1}=0,\quad l=0,..., \tag{1.13}$$

then, $q_l^{(n)}=0$ and there exists some fixed γ such that uniformly in $k:|k|\le 2n^{1/2}$

$$\left|J^{(n)}_{n+k}-1-\frac{k}{n}\gamma\right|\le C\frac{|k|^2+n^{2/3}}{n^2}. \tag{1.14}$$

Remark 1 *The convergence $J^{(n)}_{n+k}\to 1$ $(n\to\infty)$ without uniform bounds for the remainder terms was shown in [1] under much more weak conditions ($V'(\lambda)$ is a Hölder function in some neighborhood of the limiting spectrum).*

Note also (see [2]) that under conditions $C1-C4$ the limiting density of states (DOS) ρ has the form

$$\rho(\lambda)=\frac{1}{2\pi}P(\lambda)\sqrt{4-\lambda^2}\,\mathbf{1}_{|\lambda|<2}, \tag{1.15}$$

where the function P can be represented in the form

$$P(z)=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{\mathcal{L}}\frac{V'(z)-V'(\zeta)}{(z-\zeta)(\zeta^2-4)^{1/2}}d\zeta=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\frac{V'(z)-V'(2\cos y)}{z-2\cos y}dy. \tag{1.16}$$

Here the contour $\mathcal{L}\subset\Omega[d_1/2,d_2/2]$ and $\mathcal{L}$ contains inside the interval $(-2,2)$. If V is a polynomial of $2m$th degree, then it is evident that $P(z)$ is a polynomial of $(2m-2)$th degree, and conditions C3 and (2.2) guarantee that

$$|P(z)|\le C,\quad z\in\Omega[d_1/2,d_2/2],\quad P(\lambda)\ge\delta>0,\quad \lambda\in[-2,2]. \tag{1.17}$$

An important role below belongs to the following two operators:

$$P_{j,k}=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}P(2\cos y)e^{i(j-k)y}dy=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{|\zeta|=1}P(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})\zeta^{j-k-1}d\zeta \tag{1.18}$$

and $\mathcal{R}=\mathcal{P}^{-1}$ which has the entries:

$$R_{j,k}=R_{j-k}=\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\frac{e^{i(j-k)x}dx}{P(2\cos x)}=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint\frac{\zeta^{-1}\zeta^{j-k}d\zeta}{P(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})}. \tag{1.19}$$

It is important for us that

$$\delta_1\le\mathcal{R}\le\delta_2,\quad \delta_1=\inf_{\sigma}P^{-1}(\lambda),\quad \delta_2=\sup_{\sigma}P^{-1}(\lambda). \tag{1.20}$$

Remark also, that if we denote by $\mathcal{J}^*$ an infinite Jacobi matrix with constant coefficients

$$\mathcal{J}^*=\{J^*_{j,k}\}_{j,k=-\infty}^{\infty},\quad J^*_{j,k}=\delta_{j+1,k}+\delta_{j-1,k}, \tag{1.21}$$

then the spectral theorem yields that $\mathcal{P}=P(\mathcal{J}^*)$, $\mathcal{R}=P^{-1}(\mathcal{J}^*)$.

Following the approach of [21] and [8], we consider

$$\epsilon(\lambda)=\frac{1}{2}\mathrm{sign}(\lambda);\quad \epsilon f(\lambda)=\int\epsilon(\lambda-\mu)f(\mu)d\mu; \tag{1.22}$$

$$M_{j,l}=n(\psi_j^{(n)},\epsilon\psi_l^{(n)});\quad \mathcal{M}^{(0,\infty)}=\{M_{j,l}\}_{j,l=0}^{\infty};\quad \mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}=\{M_{j,l}\}_{j,l=0}^{n-1}. \tag{1.23}$$

Then, according to [21], the kernel $S_n(\lambda,\mu)$ has the form:

$$S_n(\lambda,\mu)=-\sum_{i,j=0}^{n-1}\psi_i^{(n)}(\lambda)(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1}_{i,j}(n\epsilon\psi_j^{(n)})(\mu). \tag{1.24}$$

The main result of the paper is

Theorem 1 *Consider the orthogonal ensemble of random matrices defined by (1.1)-(1.3) with* V *satisfying conditions C1-C4. Then for* λ_0 *in the bulk (*$\rho(\lambda_0) \neq 0$*) there exist weak limits of the scaled correlation functions (1.4) and these limits are given in terms of the universal matrix kernel*

$$K^{(0)}_{\infty,1}(s_1,s_2) = \lim_{n\to\infty} \frac{1}{n\rho(\lambda_0)} K_{n,1}(\lambda_0 + s_1/n\rho(\lambda_0), \lambda_0 + s_1/n\rho(\lambda_0)), \qquad (1.25)$$

where $K_{n,1}(\lambda,\mu)$ *is defined by (1.10)-(1.24), and*

$$K^{(0)}_{\infty,1}(s_1,s_2) = \begin{pmatrix} K^{(0)}_{\infty,2}(s_1-s_2) & \frac{\partial}{\partial s_1} K^{(0)}_{\infty,2}(s_1-s_2) \\ \int_0^{s_1-s_2} K^{(0)}_{\infty,2}(t)dt - \epsilon(s_1-s_2) & K^{(0)}_{\infty,2}(s_1-s_2) \end{pmatrix},$$

with $K^{(0)}_{\infty,2}(s_1-s_2)$ *of the form (1.9).*

The proof of the theorem is based on the following result

Theorem 2 *Under conditions of Theorem 1 for even* n *the matrix* $(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1}$ *defined in (1.23) is bounded uniformly in* n*, i.e.* $||(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1}|| \le C$ *where* C *is independent of* n *and* $||.||$ *is a standard norm for* $n \times n$ *matrices.*

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we prove Theorems 1 and 2. The proofs of auxiliary results are given in Section 3.

2 Proof of the main results

Proof of Theorem 2. According to the results of [2] and [14], if we restrict the integration in (1.4) by $|\lambda_i| \le L = 2 + d_1/2$, consider the polynomials $\{p_k^{(n,L)}\}_{k=0}^\infty$ orthogonal on the interval $[-L,L]$ with the weight e^{-nV} and set $\psi_k^{(n,L)} = e^{-nV/2}p_k^{(n,L)}$, then for $k \le n(1+\varepsilon)$ with some $\varepsilon > 0$

$$\sup\nolimits_{|\lambda|\le L} |\psi_k^{(n,L)}(\lambda) - \psi_k^{(n)}(\lambda)| \le e^{-nC}, \quad |\psi_k^{(n)}(\pm L)| \le e^{-nC} \qquad (2.1)$$

with some absolute C. Therefore from the very beginning we can take all integrals in (1.4), (1.8), (1.22) and (1.23) over the interval $[-L,L]$. Besides, observe that since V is an analytic function in $\Omega[d_1,d_2]$ (see (1.11)), for any natural m there exists a polynomial V_m of the $(2m)$th degree such that

$$|V_m(z)| \le C_0, \quad |V(z) - V_m(z)| \le e^{-Cm}, \quad z \in \Omega[d_1/2, d_2/2]. \qquad (2.2)$$

Here and everywhere below we denote by $C, C_0, C_1, \ldots$ positive n,m-independent constants (different in different formulas).

Take

$$m = [\log^2 n] \qquad (2.3)$$

and consider the system of polynomials $\{p_k^{(n,L,m)}\}_{k=0}^\infty$ orthogonal in the interval $[-L,L]$ with respect to the weight $e^{-nV_m(\lambda)}$. Set $\psi_k^{(n,L,m)} = p_k^{(n,L,m)} e^{-nV_m/2}$ and construct $\mathcal{M}_m^{(0,n)}$ by (1.23) with $\psi_k^{(n,L,m)}$. Then for any $k \le n + 2n^{1/2}$ and uniformly in $\lambda \in [-L,L]$

$$\begin{array}{l} |\psi_k^{(n,L)}(\lambda) - \psi_k^{(n,L,m)}(\lambda)| \le e^{-C\log^2 n}, \quad |\varepsilon\psi_k^{(n,L)}(\lambda) - \varepsilon\psi_k^{(n,L,m)}(\lambda)| \le e^{-C\log^2 n} \\ ||\mathcal{M}_m^{(0,n)} - \mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}|| \le e^{-C\log^2 n} \end{array} \qquad (2.4)$$

The proof of the first bound here is identical to the proof of (2.1) (see [14]). The second bound follows from the first one because the operator $\varepsilon : L_2[-L,L] \to C[-L,L]$ is bounded by L. The last bound in (2.4) follows from the first one and the inequality valid for the norm of an arbitrary matrix $\mathcal{A}$

$$||\mathcal{A}||^2 \le \max_i \sum_j |A_{i,j}| \cdot \max_j \sum_i |A_{i,j}|. \tag{2.5}$$

Remark also that if for arbitrary matrices $\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$ $||\mathcal{A}^{-1}|| \le C$ and $||\mathcal{A}-\mathcal{B}|| \le qC^{-1}$ with some $0 < q < 1$, then we can write $\mathcal{B} = \mathcal{A}(I - \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}-\mathcal{B}))$. Since $||\mathcal{A}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}-\mathcal{B})|| \le q < 1$, $||(I - \mathcal{A}^{-1}(\mathcal{A}-\mathcal{B}))^{-1}|| \le (1-q)^{-1}$, (see any textbook on linear algebra). Thus $\mathcal{B}$ has an inverse matrix and $||\mathcal{B}^{-1}|| \le C(1-q)^{-1}$. Moreover, $||\mathcal{A}^{-1} - \mathcal{B}^{-1}|| \le q(1-q)^{-1}C^2$. Using this simple observation and (2.4), we obtain that if $||(\mathcal{M}_m^{(0,n)})^{-1}|| \le C_1$, then $||(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1}|| \le C_1(1 - C_1 e^{-C\log^2 n})^{-1} \le 2C_1$ and

$$||(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1} - (\mathcal{M}_m^{(0,n)})^{-1}|| \le C_2 e^{-C\log^2 n}.$$

Using this bound combined with the first and the second bound of (2.4) we can compare each term of the kernel $S_{n,m}(\lambda,\mu)$ constructed by formula (1.24) with new orthogonal polynomials $\{p_k^{(n,L,m)}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ with the corresponding term of $S_n(\lambda,\mu)$. Then, since by the result of [13]

$$|\psi_k^{(n)}(\lambda)|^2 \le K_{n,2}(\lambda,\lambda) \le nC, \quad \lambda \in [-L,L],$$

and by the Schwarz inequality

$$|\epsilon\psi_k^{(n)}(\lambda)| \le (2L)^{1/2}||\psi_k^{(n)}||_2 \le (2L)^{1/2}, \quad \lambda \in [-L,L],$$

where $||.||_2$ is a standard norm in $L_2[-L,L]$, we obtain that uniformly in $\lambda,\mu \in [-L,L]$

$$|S_{n,m}(\lambda,\mu) - S_n(\lambda,\mu)| \le Cn^4 e^{-C\log^2 n} \le e^{-C'\log^2 n}. \tag{2.6}$$

Therefore below we will study $\mathcal{M}_m^{(0,n)}$ and $S_{n,m}(\lambda,\mu)$ instead of $\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}$ and $S_n(\lambda,\mu)$. To simplify notations we omit the indexes m, L, but keep the dependence on m in the estimates.

Let us set our main notations. We denote by $\mathcal{H} = l_2(-\infty,\infty)$ a Hilbert space of all infinite sequences $\{x_i\}_{i=-\infty}^{\infty}$ with a standard scalar product $(.,.)$ and a norm $||.||$. Let also $\{e_i\}_{i=-\infty}^{\infty}$ be a standard basis in $\mathcal{H}$ and $\mathcal{I}^{(n_1,n_2)}$ with $-\infty \le n_1 < n_2 \le \infty$ be an orthogonal projection operator defined as

$$\mathcal{I}^{(n_1,n_2)} e_i = \begin{cases} e_i, & n_1 \le i < n_2, \\ 0, & otherwise. \end{cases} \tag{2.7}$$

For any infinite or semi infinite matrix $\mathcal{A} = \{A_{i,j}\}$ we will denote by

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{A}^{(n_1,n_2)} = \mathcal{I}^{(n_1,n_2)}\mathcal{A}\mathcal{I}^{(n_1,n_2)}, \\ &(\mathcal{A}^{(n_1,n_2)})^{-1} = \mathcal{I}^{(n_1,n_2)}\Big(I - \mathcal{I}^{(n_1,n_2)} + \mathcal{A}^{(n_1,n_2)}\Big)^{-1}\mathcal{I}^{(n_1,n_2)}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.8}$$

so that $(\mathcal{A}^{(n_1,n_2)})^{-1}$ is a block operator which is inverse to $\mathcal{A}^{(n_1,n_2)}$ in the space $I^{(n_1,n_2)}\mathcal{H}$ and zero on the $(I - I^{(n_1,n_2)})\mathcal{H}$. We denote also by $(.,.)_2$ and $||.||_2$ a standard scalar product and a norm in $L_2[-L,L]$.

Set $\mathcal{V}^{(0,\infty)} = \{\mathcal{V}_{j,l}\}_{j,l=0}^{\infty}$, where

$$\mathcal{V}_{j,l} = \operatorname{sign}(l-j)(\psi_j^{(n)}, V'\psi_l^{(n)})_2 = \frac{2}{n}\begin{cases} (\psi_j^{(n)}, (\psi_l^{(n)})')_2, & j > l, \\ (\psi_j^{(n)}, (\psi_l^{(n)})')_2 + O(e^{-C\log^2 n}), & j \le l. \end{cases} \tag{2.9}$$

Here $O(e^{-C\log^2 n})$ appears because of the integration by parts and bounds (2.1), (2.4). Since $(\psi_k^{(n)})' = q_k e^{-nV/2}$, where q_k is a polynomial of the $(k+2m-1)$th degree, its Fourier expansion in the basis $\{\psi_k^{(n)}\}_{k=0}^{\infty}$ contains not more than $(k+2m-1)$ terms and for $|j-k| > 2m-1$ the jth coefficient is $O(e^{-C\log^2 n})$. Therefore for $k \le n + 2n^{1/2}$

$$n^{-1}(\psi_k^{(n)})' = \frac{1}{2}\sum_j \mathcal{V}_{j,k}\psi_j^{(n)} + O_2(e^{-C\log^2 n}). \tag{2.10}$$

Here and below we write $\phi(\lambda) = O_2(\varepsilon_n)$, if $||\phi||_2 \le C\varepsilon_n$. The above relation implies

$$\frac{1}{2}\epsilon\Big(\sum_j \mathcal{V}_{j,k}^{(0,\infty)}\psi_j^{(n)}\Big) = n^{-1}\psi_k^{(n)} + O_2(e^{-C\log^2 n}). \tag{2.11}$$

Hence, by (1.23), for $0 \le j,k \le n + 2n^{1/2}$

$$\frac{1}{2}(\mathcal{M}^{(0,\infty)}\mathcal{V}^{(0,\infty)})_{j,k} = \delta_{j,k} + O(e^{-C\log^2 n}). \tag{2.12}$$

Thus,

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)} = I^{(0,n)} - \mu^{(0,n)}\nu^{(0,n)} + \mathcal{E}^{(0,n)}, \quad ||\mathcal{E}^{(0,n)}|| = O(e^{-C\log^2 n}), \tag{2.13}$$

where $\nu^{(0,n)}$ is a matrix with entries equal to zero except the block $(2m-1)\times(2m-1)$ in the right bottom corner. The block has the form

$$\nu^{(m)} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_{n,n-2m+1} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{n,n-2m+3} & \dots & \mathcal{V}_{n,n-1} \\ 0 & \mathcal{V}_{n+1,n-2m+2} & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{n+2,n-2m+3} & \dots & \mathcal{V}_{n+2,n-1} \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \dots & \mathcal{V}_{n+2m-2,n-1}. \end{pmatrix} \tag{2.14}$$

$\mu^{(0,n)}$ in (2.13) has $(n-2m+1)$ first columns equal to zero and the last $(2m-1)$ ones of the form

$$\mu_{l,n-2m-1+k}^{(0,n)} = M_{l,n-1+k}, \quad k = 1,\dots,2m-1, \quad l = 0,\dots,n-1.$$

The relation (2.13) was obtained first in [8]. Applying (2.13) to any vector $x \in \mathcal{I}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{H}$, we have

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}x = x - \sum_{k=1}^{2m-1}(x, e_{n-k})f_k + \mathcal{E}^{(0,n)}x, \tag{2.15}$$

where

$$f_k = (f_{k,0},\dots,f_{k,n-1}), \quad f_{k,j} = (\mu^{(0,n)}\nu^{(0,n)})_{n-k,j}, \quad ||\mathcal{E}^{(0,n)}x|| \le e^{-C\log^2 n}||x||$$

If we make the operation of transposition of matrices in (2.13) and apply the result to any $x \in \mathcal{I}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{H}$, we get

$$\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}x = x - \sum_{k=1}^{2m-1}(x, f_k)e_{n-k} + \mathcal{E}^{(0,n)T}x, \quad ||\mathcal{E}^{(0,n)T}x|| \le e^{-C\log^2 n}||x||, \tag{2.16}$$

The idea of the proof is to show that for $|j-n|, |k-n| \le [n^{1/4}]$

$$M_{k,j-1} - M_{k,j+1} = M_{j+1,k} - M_{j-1,k} = 2R_{k-j} + \varepsilon'_{j,k}, \quad |\varepsilon'_{j,k}| \le C_* n^{-1/9}, \tag{2.17}$$

where R_k is defined by (1.19).

If we know, e.g., $M_{n-1,n}$, these relations allow us to find $M_{n+2j,n+1+2k}$, going step by step from the point $(n-1,n)$ to $(n+2j+1,n+2k)$. Then, using the symmetry $M_{j,k}=-M_{k,j}$ we obtain $M_{n+2j,n+2k+1}$. Hence, since $M_{j,k}=0$ for even $j-k$ because of the evenness, we find in such a way all $M_{j,k}$ with $|j-n|,|k-n|\le[n^{1/4}]$. Thus, if we denote $C(n)=M_{n-1,n}-M_2$ (see (2.19) for the definition of M_2), then for odd $j-k$ we have

$$M_{j,k}=M^*_{j,k}+\varepsilon_{j,k},\quad M^*_{j,k}=M_{k-j+1}-\frac{1}{2}((1+(-1)^j)M_{-\infty}-(-1)^jC(n), \tag{2.18}$$

.

$$\begin{aligned} M_k&=(1+(-1)^k)\sum_{j=k}^{\infty}R_j=P^{-1}(2)-\frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi}\frac{\sin(k-1)x\,dx}{P(2\cos x)\sin x}\\ M_{-\infty}&=2\sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty}R_j=2P^{-1}(2), \end{aligned} \tag{2.19}$$

where P is defined in (1.16), and

$$\begin{aligned} &|\varepsilon_{2j-1,2k}|\le|\varepsilon'_{n-1,n}|+|\sum_{j'\in[j,n/2]}|\varepsilon'_{2j'-1,2k}|+\sum_{k'\in[k,n/2]}|\varepsilon'_{n-1,2k}|\\ &\le C_*n^{-1/9}(1+|j-n|+|k-n|). \end{aligned} \tag{2.20}$$

Remark, that the expression for $M_{j,k}$ in the case $V(\lambda)=\lambda^{2p}+o(1)$ were obtained in [8].

Let us assume that we know (2.17) and show, how the assertion of Theorem 1 can be obtained from (2.17). The first step is

Proposition 1 *Suppose $\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}x=i\varepsilon_0x$ ($||x||=1$). Then there exists a vector $x_0\in\mathcal{I}^{(n-6m+2,n)}$ such that*

$$||x_0-x||\le||\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}||\cdot|\varepsilon_0|\le C_V|\varepsilon_0|,\quad ||\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}x_0||\le2|\varepsilon_0|, \tag{2.21}$$

where $C_V=\max_{\lambda\in[-2-d_1/2,2+d_1/2]}|V'(\lambda)|$.

The proposition allows us to replace the eigenvector x, which in principle can have nonzero components even for $|k-n|\sim n$, by the vector x_0 whose components are zero for $|k-n|>6m+2$. Then we can replace $\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}x_0$ by $\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x_0$ with $\widetilde{N}=6m+2+2[\log^2n]$ and then, using (2.17) replace $\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x_0$ by $\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x_0$ (for more details see below).

The next step is to prove that Proposition 1 and (2.17) imply the following representation of x_0

$$\begin{aligned} &x_0=c_1r_1+y,\quad r_1=(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-1},\quad ||y||\le C_3\varepsilon_1,\\ &c_1\in\mathbb{C},\quad |\,|c_1|\cdot||r_1||-1|\le C_4\varepsilon_1 \end{aligned} \tag{2.22}$$

with C_3,C_4 depending only on C_V from (2.21) and δ_1, δ_2 of (1.20). Here and below

$$\widetilde{N}=6m+2+2[\log^2n]\quad \varepsilon_1=\max\{|\epsilon_0|;2C_*n^{-1/9}\widetilde{N}^2\}, \tag{2.23}$$

with C_* defined in (2.17) and we use that (1.20) yields

$$\delta_1\mathcal{I}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\le\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\le\delta_2\mathcal{I}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}, \tag{2.24}$$

thus $(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}$ exists and $||(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}||\le\delta_1^{-1}$.

Assume that we have proved (2.22). Recall that $\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}$ is a skew symmetric matrix of the even dimension with real entries. Hence, if $i\varepsilon_0$ is its eigenvalue, $-i\varepsilon_0$ is its eigenvalue too (if $\varepsilon_0 = 0$, then this eigenvalue has multiplicity at least 2). Thus, there exists an eigenvector $x^{(1)}$ such that $\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}x^{(1)} = -i\varepsilon_0 x^{(1)}$ and

$$(x, x^{(1)}) = 0. \tag{2.25}$$

Then, using (2.22), we can conclude that there exists $x_0^{(1)}$ such that

$$||x_0^{(1)} - x^{(1)}|| \le C_V|\varepsilon_0|, \quad x_0^{(1)} = c_1^{(1)} r_1 + y^{(1)}$$

with the same r_1 and some $y^{(1)}$ and $c_1^{(1)}$, such that

$$||y^{(1)}|| \le C_3\varepsilon_1, \quad \Big| |c_1^{(1)}| \cdot ||r_1|| - 1 \Big| \le C_4\varepsilon_1,$$

where ε_1 is defined in (2.23). Hence, it is easy to see that

$$|(x_0^{(1)}, x_0)| \ge |c_1| \cdot |c_1^{(1)}| \cdot ||r_1||^2 - C_5\varepsilon_1 \ge 1 - C_6\varepsilon_1$$

where C_6 depends only on δ_1, δ_2 and $||\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}||$. On the other hand, it follows from (2.25) and (2.21) that

$$|(x_0^{(1)}, x_0)| \le 2C_V\varepsilon_1 + C_V^2\varepsilon_1^2$$

The last two inequalities give us the contradiction, if $|\varepsilon_0| \le C_0$, where C_0 is some constant depending only on δ_1, δ_2 and C_V. Hence, we conclude that $\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}$ have no eigenvalues in the interval $[-iC_0, iC_0]$.

Thus, we have proved that (2.22) yields the assertion of Theorem 1. Let us derive (2.22) from (2.17) and Proposition 1.

Since $\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)} = \mathcal{I}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{I}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}$ and $x_0 \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\mathcal{H}$, in view of Proposition 1 we have

$$||\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x_0|| \le ||\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}x_0|| \le 2|\varepsilon_0|.$$

Hence, using (2.18) and (2.20) and (2.5), we have

$$\begin{aligned}||\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x_0|| &\le ||\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x_0|| + ||(\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)} - \mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)})x_0|| \\ &\le 2|\varepsilon_0| + 2C_* n^{-1/9}\widetilde{N}^2 \le 3\varepsilon_1.\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, denoting $\widetilde{y} = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x_0$ and using that $||\mathcal{D}|| \le 2$ (see (2.5)), we have

$$||\widetilde{y}|| = \frac{1}{2}||\mathcal{D}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x_0|| \le 3\varepsilon_1$$

On the other hand, using the definition (2.19), we get

$$\widetilde{y} = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x_0 = \mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x_0 - (x_0, \mu_1)e_{n-1} + (x_0, \mu_{\widetilde{N}})e_{n-\widetilde{N}}, \tag{2.26}$$

where $\mu_1, \mu_{\widetilde{N}} \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\mathcal{H}$ and have the components $\mu_{1j} = M^*_{n,i}$, $\mu_{\widetilde{N}j} = M^*_{n-\widetilde{N}-1,j}$, $i = n - \widetilde{N}, \dots, n-1$. Note, that the second equality in (2.26) is valid for any x, not only for $x = x_0$. If we apply $(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}$ to both sides of the above equality and denote

$$\begin{aligned}&r_{\widetilde{N}} = (\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-\widetilde{N}}, \quad \widetilde{y}_0 = (\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}\widetilde{y}, \\ &c_1 = (x_0, \mu_1), \quad c_{\widetilde{N}} = -(x_0, \mu_{\widetilde{N}}), \quad \rho = ||r_1|| = ||r_{\widetilde{N}}||,\end{aligned} \tag{2.27}$$

we get (cf (2.22))

$$x_0 = c_1 r_1 + c_{\widetilde{N}} r_{\widetilde{N}} + \widetilde{y}_0, \quad ||\widetilde{y}_0|| \le 3\varepsilon_1 \cdot ||\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}|| \le 3\varepsilon_1 \delta_1^{-1} \tag{2.28}$$

and by the definition (2.27) and (2.24) we have $\delta_2^{-1} \le \rho \le \delta_1^{-1}$.

To proceed further we need some facts from the theory of Jacobi matrices.

Proposition 2 *Let J be a Jacobi matrix with entries $|J_{j,j+1}| \le 1 + d_1/4$ and Q be a bounded analytic function ($|Q(z)| \le C_0$) in $\Omega[d_1/2, d_2/2]$. Then:*
(i) for any j, k

$$|Q(\mathcal{J})_{j,k}| \le C e^{-d|j-k|}; \tag{2.29}$$

(ii) if $\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}$ is another Jacobi matrix, satisfying the same conditions, then for any $j, k \in [n_1, n_2)$

$$\begin{aligned} &|Q(\mathcal{J})_{j,k} - Q(\widetilde{\mathcal{J}})_{j,k}| \le \\ &\qquad C\Big(\sup_{i \in [n_1,n_2)} |J_{i,i+1} - \widetilde{J}_{i,i+1}| e^{-d|j-k|} + e^{-d(|n_1-j|+|n_1-k|)} + e^{-d(|n_2-j|+|n_2-k|)}\Big); \end{aligned} \tag{2.30}$$

(iii) if $Q(\lambda) > \delta > 0$ for $\lambda \in [-2 - d_1/2, 2 + d_1/2]$, then for $i, j \in [n_1, n_2)$

$$\begin{aligned} &|(Q(\mathcal{J})^{(n_1,n_2)})^{-1}_{j,k} - Q^{-1}(\mathcal{J})_{j,k}| \\ &\qquad\qquad \le C \min\left\{e^{-d|n_1-j|} + e^{-d|n_2-j|}, e^{-d|n_1-k|} + e^{-d|n_2-k|}\right\}, \\ &\qquad |(Q(\mathcal{J})^{(n_1,n_2)})^{-1}_{j,k} - (Q(\mathcal{J})^{(-\infty,n_2)})^{-1}_{j,k}| \le C \min\left\{e^{-d|n_1-j|}, e^{-d|n_1-k|}\right\}, \end{aligned} \tag{2.31}$$

where C and d depend only on d_1, d_2, C_0 and δ.

The proof of Proposition 2 is given at the end of Section 3.

Using the exponential bounds (2.31) and (2.29), we obtain that the definition of r_1 and $r_{\widetilde{N}}$ (see (2.22) and (2.27)) imply

$$|(r_1, r_{\widetilde{N}})| = \left| \sum_{j=n-\widetilde{N}}^{n-1} (\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}_{n-1,j} (\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}_{n-\widetilde{N},j} \right| \le C\widetilde{N} e^{-c\widetilde{N}} \tag{2.32}$$

Hence, taking (x_0, x_0), we obtain from (2.28)

$$\begin{aligned} &(|c_1|^2 + |c_{\widetilde{N}}|^2)\rho^2 - (|c_1|^2 + |c_{\widetilde{N}}|^2)^{1/2}\rho\left(||\widetilde{y}_0|| + O(e^{-c\widetilde{N}/2})\right) - ||\widetilde{y}_0||^2 \le (x_0, x_0) \\ &\qquad \le (|c_1|^2 + |c_{\widetilde{N}}|^2)\rho^2 + (|c_1|^2 + |c_{\widetilde{N}}|^2)^{1/2}\rho\left(||\widetilde{y}_0|| + O(e^{-d\widetilde{N}/2})\right) + ||\widetilde{y}_0||^2. \end{aligned}$$

Note that these inequalities are quadratic with respect to $(|c_1|^2 + |c_{\widetilde{N}}|^2)^{1/2}\rho$. Hence, using that $(x, x) = 1$ and so, by (2.21), $|(x_0, x_0) - 1| \le 2C_V|\varepsilon_1 + C_V^2\varepsilon_1^2$, we obtain that there exists C_1 depending only on δ_1, δ_2, C_V, such that

$$1 - C_1\varepsilon_1 \le (c_1^2 + c_{\widetilde{N}}^2)^{1/2}\rho \le 1 + C_1\varepsilon_1. \tag{2.33}$$

On the other hand, since by Proposition 1 $x_0 \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-6m+2,n)}\mathcal{H}$, similarly to (2.32), we have from the exponential bounds (2.31) and (2.29) that

$$(x_0, r_{\widetilde{N}}) = O(e^{-c\log^2 n}).$$

Thus, taking the scalar product of the r.h.s. of (2.28) with $r_{\widetilde{N}}$, we get from (2.32) that there exist C_2 depending only on δ_1, δ_2, C_V, such that

$$|c_{\widetilde{N}}| \le C_2 \varepsilon_1.$$

Collecting the above bounds, we obtain (2.22).

To finish the proof of Theorem 1 we are left to prove (2.17). Define $\mathcal{V}^* = \{\mathcal{V}^*_{j,l}\}_{j,l=-\infty}^{\infty}$ with $\mathcal{V}^*_{j,l} = \mathrm{sign}(l-j)V'(\mathcal{J}^*)_{j,l}$, where $\mathcal{J}^*$ is defined in (1.21). Then by the spectral theorem

$$\mathcal{V}^*_{j,l} = \mathcal{V}^*_{j-l} = \frac{\mathrm{sign}(l-j)}{2\pi} \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} dx V'(2\cos x) e^{i(j-l)x}. \tag{2.34}$$

The key point in the proof of (2.17) is the lemma:

Lemma 1 *Under conditions of Theorem 1*

$$\mathcal{V}^* = \mathcal{P}\mathcal{D} = \mathcal{D}\mathcal{P}, \tag{2.35}$$

where $\mathcal{P}$ *is defined in (1.18) and*

$$\mathcal{D} = \{D_{j,k}\}_{j,k=-\infty}^{\infty}, \quad D_{j,k} = \delta_{j+1,k} - \delta_{j-1,k}. \tag{2.36}$$

Moreover, for $N = 2[n^{1/4}]$ *there exist some error matrices* $\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ *and* $\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}$*, whose entries are equal to zero if* $|j-n| > N+2m$*, or* $|k-n| > N+2m$*, or* $|j-k| > 2m-2$*, admit the bounds*

$$\begin{array}{l} |\tilde{P}_{j,k}| \le CNmn^{-1}, \\ \widetilde{D}_{j,k} = \delta_{j+1,k} d_{j+1}, \quad |d_j| \le Cm^2 n^{-1}, \end{array} \tag{2.37}$$

and satisfy the relation

$$\mathcal{V}_{j,k} = (\mathcal{D} + \widetilde{\mathcal{D}})(\mathcal{P} + \widetilde{\mathcal{P}})_{j,k} + \widetilde{\varepsilon}_{j,k}, \quad |k-n| \le N,\ |j-n| \le N+2m, \tag{2.38}$$

where $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_{j,k} = 0$*, if* $|j-k| > 2m-1$ *and*

$$|\widetilde{\varepsilon}_{j,k}| \le CNm^4 n^{-2}, \quad if \quad |j-k| \le 2m-1. \tag{2.39}$$

Remark 2 *Let us note that if we write (2.35) for components and use (**??**) and (2.30), we obtain for* $n-N+1 \le j,k \le n+N-1$,

$$\mathcal{V}_{j,k} = (\mathcal{P}\mathcal{D})_{j,k} + O(Nmn^{-1}).$$

It would be possible to use this representation of $\mathcal{V}_{j,k}$ *instead of (2.38), if we know from the very beginning that* $||\epsilon\psi_k^{(n)}||_2 = O(n^{-1/2})$*. The last relation in principle could be obtained from the results of [5] on the asymptotic of orthogonal polynomial* $p_k^{(n)}$ *for* $n-N+1 \le k \le n+N-1$*. But from our point of view it is more simple to prove more precise relations (2.38)-(2.39), which make it possible to prove (2.17) without integration of the asymptotic of [5]. One more reason do not use [5] is to make our proof applicable to non analytic potentials* V*, for which [5] does not work.*

Since ε is a bounded operator in $L_2[-2-d/2, 2+d/2]$ by (2.11), (2.38), (2.39) and (2.11) we have for $|k-n| < N$

$$\frac{1}{2}\sum_j (\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)} + \widetilde{\mathcal{P}})_{j,k} \left((1+d_j)\epsilon\psi_{j-1}^{(n)} - \epsilon\psi_{j+1}^{(n)}\right) = n^{-1}\psi_k^{(n)} + r_k, \tag{2.40}$$

where $O_2(.)$ is defined in (2.10) and for $|k-n|<N$

$$r_k := \frac{1}{2}\sum_{|j-k|\le 2m-1} \widetilde{\varepsilon}_{j,k}\epsilon\psi_j^{(n)} + O_2(e^{-C\log^2 n}) = O_2(Nm^5n^{-2}). \tag{2.41}$$

Let us extend (2.40) to all $0\le k<\infty$, choosing r_k for $|k-n|\ge N$ in such a way to obtain for these k identical equalities:

$$r_k := \sum_{j>0}(\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)}+\widetilde{\mathcal{P}})_{j,k}\Big((1+d_j)\epsilon\psi_{j-1}^{(n)} - \epsilon\psi_{j+1}^{(n)}\Big) - \frac{1}{n}\psi_k^{(n)} = O_2(1), \tag{2.42}$$

Since $\mathcal{P} > \delta_2^{-1}$(see (1.20)) $\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)} > \delta_2^{-1}\mathcal{I}^{(0,\infty)}$. Moreover, by 2.5) and (2.37),

$$||\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}|| \le CNm^2n^{-1}.$$

Hence, $\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)}+\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$ has an inverse operator bounded uniformly in n. Then, using twice the resolvent identity

$$H_1^{-1} - H_2^{-1} = H_1^{-1}(H_2-H_1)H_2^{-1} \tag{2.43}$$

for $H_1=\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)}$, $H_2=\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)}+\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}$, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}(\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)}+\widetilde{\mathcal{P}})^{-1} = (\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)})^{-1} &- (\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)})^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)})^{-1}\\ &+ (\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)})^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)})^{-1}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)}+\widetilde{\mathcal{P}})^{-1}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{1}{2}\Big((1+d_j)\epsilon\psi_{j-1}^{(n)} - \epsilon\psi_{j+1}^{(n)}\Big) &= \sum_{k>0}\Big((\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)}+\widetilde{\mathcal{P}})^{-1}\Big)_{k,j}(n^{-1}\psi_k^{(n)}+r_k)\\ &= n^{-1}\sum_{k>0}(\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)})^{-1}_{k,j}\psi_k^{(n)} + \sum_{k>0}\Big((\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)})^{-1}(I-\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}(\mathcal{P}^{(0,\infty)})^{-1})\Big)_{k,j}r_k\\ &+ O_2(n^{-1}||\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}||) + O_2(||\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}||^2) = n^{-1}\Sigma_{1j} + \Sigma_{2j} + O_2(||\widetilde{\mathcal{P}}||^2).\end{aligned} \tag{2.44}$$

Using (2.31) and (2.41), it is easy to obtain that uniformly in $|j-n|\le N/2$

$$||\Sigma_{2j}||_2 \le C\sup_{|k-j|\le N/2}||r_k||_2 + Ce^{-cN}\sup_k ||r_k||_2 \le CNm^4n^{-2}.$$

Besides, it follows from (2.31) that uniformly in $|j-n|\le N/2$

$$\Sigma_{1j} - \sum_{k>0}\mathcal{P}^{-1}_{j,k}\psi_k^{(n)}(\lambda) = O_2(e^{-cn}).$$

Hence, we get from (2.44) that

$$(1+d_j)\epsilon\psi_{j-1}^{(n)} - \epsilon\psi_{j+1}^{(n)} = 2n^{-1}\sum_{k>0}R_{j,k}\psi_k^{(n)} + O_2(N^2m^4n^{-2}). \tag{2.45}$$

where d_j is defined in (2.37) and $R_{j,k}$ is defined in (1.19).

Proposition 3 *There exists $j: n\le j<n+N/2$ ($N=[n^{1/4}]$) such that*

$$||\epsilon\psi_j^{(n)}||_2^2 + ||\epsilon\psi_{j-1}^{(n)}||_2^2 \le CN^{-1}. \tag{2.46}$$

Using the proposition and (2.45), we obtain by induction that (2.46) holds with some C_1 for all $j : |j-n| \le N/2$. Hence (2.45) yields for all $j : |j-n| \le N/2$

$$\epsilon\psi_{j-1}^{(n)} - \epsilon\psi_{j+1}^{(n)} = 2n^{-1}\sum_{k>0} R_{j,k}\psi_k^{(n)} + O_2(m^2n^{-1}N^{-1/2}),$$

where we used the bound (2.37) for d_j and also that $N^2m^4n^{-2} \le m^2n^{-1}N^{-1/2}$. Multiplying the relation by $\psi_k^{(n)}$ and using (1.23), we get (2.17).

The assertion of Theorem 1 is proved. In addition let us prove that the constant $C(n)$ from (2.19) tends to zero, as $n \to \infty$. To this end consider the matrix $\mathcal{M}^{(0,n+1)}$. It is a skew symmetric matrix of the odd dimension, hence it has at least one zero eigenvalue. Let x be a corresponding eigenvector. Applying $\mathcal{V}^{(0,n+1)}\mathcal{M}^{(0,n+1)}x = 0$ we conclude that $x \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-2m+2,n+1)}\mathcal{H}$. Then repeating the arguments, using in the proof of (2.22), we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned}&||\mathcal{D}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)}\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)}x|| \le \varepsilon_1,\\ &x = c_1(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)})^{-1}e_n + y, \quad ||y|| \le \varepsilon_1.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (2.26) for x, represented as above, we get

$$\begin{aligned}&\frac{1}{2}\mathcal{D}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)}\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)}x = \Big(1 - ((\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)})^{-1}e_n, \mu_0)\Big)\, c_1e_n + \tilde{y}\\ &||\tilde{y}|| \le C\varepsilon_1,\end{aligned}$$

where $\widetilde{N}$, ε_1 are defined in (2.23), $\mu_0 \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)}\mathcal{H}$ and its components for $i = 0, 2, \dots, n-\widetilde{N}$ are $\mu_{0,i} = M^*_{n+1,n-i} = M_{-i} + C(n)$ (see (2.19)). Hence, we conclude that

$$\Delta_n := |1 - ((\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)})^{-1}e_n, \mu_0)| \le C\varepsilon_1 \tag{2.47}$$

But it follows from (2.29) and (2.31), that we can consider only the last (2m-1) components of μ_0

$$|((\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)})^{-1}e_n, \mu_0) - ((\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)})^{-1}e_n, \mathcal{I}^{(n-2m,n+1)}\mu_0)| \le e^{-cm} = e^{-c\log^2 m}.$$

On the other hand, the definition of $\mu_{0,i}$ and (2.18), combined with (2.29) and (2.31) yield

$$\mathcal{I}^{(n-2m,n+1)}\mu_0 = C(n)\sum_{i=0}^{m} e_{n-2i} + \sum_{i=0}^{m}\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)}e_{n-2i} + O(e^{-c\log^2 n}).$$

Using this representation in (2.47), we obtain that

$$\Delta_n = |C(n)\sum_{i=0}^{m}(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)})^{-1}_{n,n-2i} + O(e^{-c\log^2 n})| \le C\varepsilon_1 \tag{2.48}$$

Lemma 2

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m}(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)})^{-1}_{n,n-2i} = \Big[(\mathcal{R}^{(-\infty,n+1)})^{-1}_{n,n}\Big]^{1/2} P^{1/2}(2) + O(e^{-c\log^2 n}), \tag{2.49}$$

Lemma 2 and (2.48) give us

$$|C(n)| \le C\varepsilon_1 \le C' n^{-1/9}\log^2 n,$$

where C' depends only on C_V of δ_1, δ_2 of (1.20) and C_* of (2.19).

□

Corollary 1 *Under conditions of Theorem 1 for $n > j, k > n - 2[\log^2 n]$*

$$(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1}_{j,k} = \frac{1}{2}((\mathcal{R}^{(-\infty,n)})^{-1}\mathcal{D}^{(-\infty,n)})_{j,k} + \frac{1}{2}b_j a_k + O(n^{-1/10}), \qquad (2.50)$$

where

$$a_k = ((\mathcal{R}^{(-\infty,n)})^{-1}e_{n-1})_k, \quad b_j = ((\mathcal{R}^{(-\infty,n)})^{-1}r^*)_j, \quad r^*_{n-i} = R_i \qquad (2.51)$$

with R_i defined by (1.19). For other j, k

$$(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1}_{j,k} = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}_{j,k} + O(e^{-c\log^2 n}) \qquad (2.52)$$

Proof of Corollary 1. According to Theorem 1, $||(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1}|| \le C$, with some n-independent C, hence, applying $(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1}$ from the left to both sides of (2.13) and using that $(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1}$ is a skew symmetric matrix, we obtain (2.52) and prove that $(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1}$ has not more than $(4m-1)$ nonzero diagonals. Thus, it follows from the standard linear algebra arguments, that if we consider $\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}$ with $\widetilde{N}$ defined in (2.23), then $\widetilde{N} - 2m$ last columns of $(\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)})^{-1}$ coincide with that of $(\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}$, if it exists. But according to (2.20) and (2.5), if there exists $(\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}$, and $||(\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}|| \le C$ with some C independent of n, then $(\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}$ also exists and

$$||(\mathcal{M}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1} - \mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}|| \le C'n^{-1/9}\log^2 n,$$

Thus, for our goal it is enough to study $(\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}$. Using (2.26), we have

$$\mathcal{D}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)} = \mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\left(\mathcal{I}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)} - \Pi_1^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)} + \Pi_{\widetilde{N}}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\right), \qquad (2.53)$$

where $\Pi_1^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}$ and $\Pi_{\widetilde{N}}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}$ are rank one matrices of the form

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_1^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x &= (\mu_1, x)(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-1}, \\ \Pi_{\widetilde{N}}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}x &= (\mu_{\widetilde{N}}, x)(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-\widetilde{N}}, \end{aligned}$$

where μ_1 and μ_n are defined in (2.26). Since $(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-\widetilde{N}}$ and $\mu_{\widetilde{N}}$ have zero odd components, while $((\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-1}$ and μ_1 – have zero even ones,

$$(\mu_1, (\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-\widetilde{N}}) = (\mu_{\widetilde{N}}, (\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-1}) = 0.$$

Thus, using the standard linear algebra arguments, we obtain that the matrix $(\mathcal{I}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)} - \Pi_1^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)} + \Pi_{\widetilde{N}}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})$ has the inverse matrix bounded uniformly in n iff

$$|\Delta_n| := |1 - (\mu_1, (\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-1})| = |1 + (\mu_{\widetilde{N}}, (\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-\widetilde{N}})| \ge C \qquad (2.54)$$

Here the last equality follows from (2.19) and the symmetry of $(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}$. But using the same arguments, as in the proof of $C(n) \to 0$, we obtain (cf (2.48))

$$\Delta_n = (M_{-\infty} + C(n))\sum_{i=0}^{m}(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}_{n-1,n-2i+1} + O(e^{-c\log^2 n})$$

Now, using that

$$(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}_{n-1,n-2i+1} = (\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N}+1,n+1)})^{-1}_{n,n-2i} = (\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)})^{-1}_{n,n-2i} + O(e^{-c\log^2 n})$$

(see (2.31) for the last relation), by (2.49) we obtain (2.54) and therefore it follows from (2.53)

$$(\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1} = (\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}\mathcal{D}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)} + \Delta_n^{-1}(\Pi_1^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)} - \Pi_{\widetilde{N}}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}\mathcal{D}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}$$

Taking into account the definition of $\Pi_1^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}$ and $\Pi_{\widetilde{N}}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}$ we have

$$(\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}x = ((\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}\mathcal{D}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})x + ((\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-1}, x)\nu + ((\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}e_{n-\widetilde{N}}, x)\nu',$$

where $\nu \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-2m,n)}\mathcal{H}$, $\nu' \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-\tilde{N},n-\tilde{N}+2m)}\mathcal{H}$ and $||\nu||, ||\nu'|| \le C\widetilde{N}$. Then (2.31), (2.29) and imply that for any $x \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-2m,n)}\mathcal{H}$ the last term of the above relation is $O(e^{-c\log^2 n})$. Hence, for any $x \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-2m,n)}\mathcal{H}$, $||x|| \le 1$

$$(\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}x = ((\mathcal{R}^{(-\infty,n)})^{-1}\mathcal{D}^{(-\infty,n)})x + (a,x)\nu + O(e^{-c\log^2 n}), \quad (2.55)$$

where the vector a is defined in (2.51) and we use the notation $x_1 = O(e^{-c\log^2 n})$ for vector $x_1 \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n)}\mathcal{H}$, if all its components $x_{1i} = O(e^{-c\log^2 n})$.

Making the transposition of both sides of the last equation (recall that $\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)T} = -\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)}$ and $\mathcal{D}^{(-\infty,n)T} = -\mathcal{D}^{(-\infty,n)}$), we get for any $x \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-2m,n)}\mathcal{H}$

$$(\mathcal{M}^{*(n-\widetilde{N},n)})^{-1}x = (\mathcal{D}^{(-\infty,n)}(\mathcal{R}^{(-\infty,n)})^{-1})x - (x,\nu)a + O(e^{-c\log^2 n}) \quad (2.56)$$

Subtracting (2.55) from (2.56) we have

$$[(\mathcal{R}^{(-\infty,n)})^{-1}, \mathcal{D}^{(-\infty,n)}]x = (a,x)\nu + (\nu,x)a + O(e^{-c\log^2 n}) \quad (2.57)$$

where the symbol $[.,.]$ means the commutator.

On the other hand, it is easy to see that

$$[\mathcal{D}^{(-\infty,n)}, \mathcal{R}^{(-\infty,n)}]x = (x, r^*)e_{n-1} + (x, e_{n-1})r^*,$$

where r^* is defined in Corollary 1. Hence,

$$[(\mathcal{R}^{(-\infty,n)})^{-1}, \mathcal{D}^{(-\infty,n)}]x = (x,a)b + (x,b)a,$$

with a, b defined in (2.51). Using the last relation and (2.57), we obtain that for any $x \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-2m,n)}\mathcal{H}$

$$(x,a)b + (x,b)a = (a,x)\nu + (\nu,x)a + O(e^{-c\log^2 n}). \quad (2.58)$$

Taking an arbitrary x such that $(a,x) = (b,x) = 0$ we obtain that

$$\nu = \lambda_1 a + \lambda_2 b + O(e^{-c\log^2 n})$$

Substituting this expression in (2.58) we obtain $\lambda_1 = O(e^{-c\log^2 n})$, $\lambda_2 = 1 - O(e^{-c\log^2 n})$. This relations combined with (2.55) prove (2.50).

□

Proof of Theorem 1. Substituting (2.50) in (1.24) and using (2.11), we obtain

$$S_n(\lambda,\mu) = K_{n,2}(\lambda,\mu) + nr_n(\lambda,\mu), \tag{2.59}$$

where $K_{n,2}(\lambda,\mu)$ is defined by (1.6) and

$$r_n(\lambda,\mu) = \sum_{j,k=-2m+1}^{2m-1} r_{j,k}\psi_{n-j}^{(n)}(\lambda)(\epsilon\psi_{n-j}^{(n)})(\mu), \quad |r_{j,k}| \le C. \tag{2.60}$$

According to the result of [21], to prove the weak convergence of all correlation functions it is enough to prove the weak convergence of cluster functions, which have the form

$$R_n(s_1,\dots,s_k) = \frac{\mathrm{Tr} K_{n,1}(\lambda_0 + \frac{s_1}{n\rho(\lambda_0)}, \lambda_0 + \frac{s_2}{n\rho(\lambda_0)})\dots K_{n,1}(\lambda_0 + \frac{s_1}{n\rho(\lambda_0)}, \lambda_0 + \frac{s_1}{n\rho(\lambda_0)})}{(n\rho(\lambda_0))^k}, \tag{2.61}$$

where the matrix kernel $K_{n,1}(\lambda,\mu)$ has the form (1.10) with

$$Sd_n(\lambda,\mu) = -n^{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}S_n(\lambda,\mu), \quad IS_n(\lambda,\mu) = n\int \epsilon(\lambda-\lambda')S_n(\lambda',\mu)d\lambda'.$$

Define similarly

$$\begin{aligned} Kd_{n,2}(\lambda,\mu) &= n^{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}K_{n,2}(\lambda,\mu), \quad IK_{n,2}(\lambda,\mu) = n\int \epsilon(\lambda-\lambda')K_{n,2}(\lambda',\mu)d\lambda' \\ rd_n(\lambda,\mu) &= -n^{-1}\frac{\partial}{\partial\mu}r_n(\lambda,\mu), \quad Ir_n(\lambda,\mu) = n\int \epsilon(\lambda-\lambda')r_n(\lambda',\mu)d\lambda'. \end{aligned} \tag{2.62}$$

Lemma 3 *Under conditions of Theorem 1 uniformly in* $|k-n| \le n^{1/5}$

$$||\epsilon\psi_k^{(n)}||_2 = O(n^{-1/2}), \tag{2.63}$$

and for any $\delta > 0$ *there exist* C *such that uniformly in* $\lambda \in [-2+\delta, 2-\delta]$

$$|\epsilon\psi_k^{(n)}(\lambda)| \le C\left[n^{-1} + (1-(-1)^k)n^{-1/2}\right]. \tag{2.64}$$

Moreover, for any compact $\mathbb{K} \subset \mathbb{R}$ *uniformly in* $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{K}$

$$\left|\left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_1} + \frac{\partial}{\partial s_2}\right)K_{n,2}(\lambda_0 + s_1/n, \lambda_0 + s_2/n)\right| \le C, \tag{2.65}$$

$$n^{-1}IK_{n,2}(\lambda_0 + s_1/(n\rho(\lambda_0)), \lambda_0 + s_2/(n\rho(\lambda_0))) \to \epsilon K_{\infty,2}^{(0)}(s_1 - s_2). \tag{2.66}$$

Since in (2.59)-(2.60) $r_{j,k} = 0$, if both j,k are odd, the bounds (2.64) and relations (2.59)-(2.60) yield that uniformly in $s_1, s_2 \in \mathbb{K}$

$$\left|\left|\frac{1}{n}K_{n,1}(\lambda_0 + \frac{s_1}{n\rho(\lambda_0)}, \lambda_0 + \frac{s_2}{n\rho(\lambda_0)}) - \frac{1}{n}\widetilde{K}_{n,1}(\lambda_0 + \frac{s_1}{n\rho(\lambda_0)}, \lambda_0 + \frac{s_2}{n\rho(\lambda_0)})\right|\right| \le \frac{Cm^2}{n^{1/2}}, \tag{2.67}$$

where

$$\widetilde{K}_{n,1}(\lambda,\mu) = \begin{pmatrix} K_{n,2}(\lambda,\mu) & Kd_{n,2}S_n(\lambda,\mu) \\ IK_{n,2}(\lambda,\mu) - \epsilon(\lambda-\mu) & K_{n,2}(\mu,\lambda) \end{pmatrix}$$

Hence, we can replace $K_{n,1}$ by $\widetilde{K}_{n,1}$ in (2.61). Then, using integration by parts and (2.65), we obtain that

$$I(a,b) = \int_a^b \dots \int_a^b R_n(s_1, \dots s_k) ds_1 \dots ds_k$$

can be represented as a finite sum of the terms:

$$\begin{aligned} T(a,b;k_1,\dots,k_p;l_1,\dots,l_q) = \int_a^b \dots \int_a^b ds_1 \dots ds_k F_1(s_1,s_2) \dots F_k(s_k,s_1) \\ \left(\delta(s_{k_1}-a) - \delta(s_{k_1}-b) + \dots + \delta(s_{k_p}-a) - \delta(s_{k_p}-b)\right), \end{aligned} \tag{2.68}$$

where

$$F_i(s,s') = \frac{1}{n\rho(\lambda_0)} \begin{cases} IK_{n,2}(\lambda_0 + \frac{s}{n\rho(\lambda_0)}, \lambda_0 + \frac{s'}{n\rho(\lambda_0)}) - \epsilon(s_1 - s_2), & i = l_1 \dots, l_q, \\ K_{n,2}(\lambda_0 + \frac{s}{n\rho(\lambda_0)}, \lambda_0 + \frac{s'}{n\rho(\lambda_0)}), & otherwise \end{cases}$$

Using the result of [13] on the universality for the unitary ensemble and (2.66) we can take the limit $n \to \infty$ in each of these term. Theorem 1 is proved.

3 Auxiliary results

Proof of Proposition 1 According to (2.16) and the assumption of the proposition, we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}x = x - \sum_{i=1}^{2m-1} (f_i,x)e_{n-i} = i\varepsilon_0 \mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}x \\ &\Rightarrow x = \sum_{i=1}^{2m-1} (f_i,x)e_{n-i} + i\varepsilon_0 \mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}x. \end{aligned} \tag{3.1}$$

Denote

$$\widetilde{x} = i\varepsilon_0 \mathcal{V}^{(0,n)} \mathcal{I}^{(0,n-2m+1)}x, \quad x_0 = x - \widetilde{x}. \tag{3.2}$$

Since $\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}$ has only $4m-1$ nonzero diagonals, $\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{I}^{(n-2m+1,n)}x \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-6m+2,n)}\mathcal{H}$. Hence, using the second line of (3.1), we get

$$x_0 = \sum_{i=1}^{2m-1} (f_i,x)e_{n-i} + i\varepsilon_0 \mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{I}^{(n-2m+1,n)}x \in \mathcal{I}^{(n-6m+2,n)}\mathcal{H}.$$

Besides, evidently

$$||x - x_0|| = ||\widetilde{x}|| = |\varepsilon_0| \cdot ||\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{I}^{(0,n-2m+1)}x|| \le |\varepsilon_0| C_V.$$

Moreover,

$$||\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}\widetilde{x}|| = |\varepsilon_0| \cdot ||\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{I}^{(0,n-2m+1)}x||.$$

But, by (2.15) for any $y \in \mathcal{I}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{H}$

$$\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{V}^{(0,n)}y = y - \sum_{i=1}^{2m-1} (y, e_{n-i})f_i$$

Applying this formula to $y = \mathcal{I}^{(0,n-2m+1)}x \in \mathcal{I}^{(0,n)}\mathcal{H}$ and taking into account that $(\mathcal{I}^{(0,n-2m+1)}x, e_{n-i}) = 0$ for all $i = 1, \dots, 2m-1$, we have

$$||\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}\widetilde{x}|| = |\varepsilon_0| \cdot ||\mathcal{I}^{(0,n-2m+1)}x|| \le |\varepsilon_0|.$$

Hence,

$$||\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}x_0|| = ||\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}(x-\widetilde{x})|| \le ||\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}x|| + ||\mathcal{M}^{(0,n)}\widetilde{x}|| \le 2|\varepsilon_0|.$$

Proposition 1 is proved.

□

Proof of Lemma 1. According to the standard theory of Toeplitz matrices

$$\mathcal{V}^*_{k,j} = \mathcal{V}^*_{k-j} = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{i(k-j)x}\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(x)dx,$$

where

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(x) = 2\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} V'_k \sin kx, \quad V'_k = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int_{-\pi}^{\pi} e^{ikx}V'(2\cos x)dx, \tag{3.3}$$

and to prove (2.35) it is enough to prove that

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(x) = 2\sin x \cdot P(2\cos x). \tag{3.4}$$

Replacing in (1.16) $z \to 2\cos x$, $2\cos y \to (\zeta + \zeta^{-1})$, $dy \to (i\zeta)^{-1}d\zeta$ and using the Cauchy theorem, we get

$$\begin{aligned} P(2\cos x) = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{|\zeta|=1+\delta} \frac{V'(\zeta+\zeta^{-1}) - V'(2\cos x)}{\zeta+\zeta^{-1}-2\cos x}\zeta^{-1}d\zeta = \\ \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{|\zeta|=1+\delta} \frac{\sum V'_k(\zeta^k+\zeta^{-k})d\zeta}{(\zeta-e^{ix})(\zeta-e^{-ix})} = \frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{|\zeta|=1+\delta}\frac{\sum V'_k\zeta^k d\zeta}{(\zeta-e^{ix})(\zeta-e^{-ix})} \\ = \sum_k V'_k\frac{\sin kx}{\sin x} = \frac{\widetilde{\mathcal{V}}(x)}{2\sin x}. \end{aligned}$$

To prove (2.38) it is enough to show that there exists d_j and $\tilde{P}_{j,k}$, satisfying (2.37) such that for $|j-n| \le N$

$$(\mathcal{D}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}} + \widetilde{\mathcal{D}}\mathcal{P})_{j,k} = (\mathcal{V}-\mathcal{V}^*)_{j,k}. \tag{3.5}$$

Then if we take $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_{j,k} = (\widetilde{\mathcal{D}}\widetilde{\mathcal{P}})_{j,k}$, relations (2.38) become identities and it follows from (2.37) that

$$|\widetilde{\varepsilon}_{j,k}| \le (4m-2)\max_{k-2m-1\le j\le k+2m-1}|d_j||\widetilde{P}_{j+1,k}| \le CNm^4n^{-2}.$$

Denote by $\Delta\mathcal{V}_{j,k}$ the r.h.s. of (3.5). Then for any fixed k (3.5) is equivalent to the system of equations

$$\begin{aligned} &\widetilde{P}_{j+1,k} - \widetilde{P}_{j-1,k} = \Delta\mathcal{V}_{j,k} - P_{k-j-1}d_{j+1}, \quad j = k-2m+1,\dots k+2m-1, \\ &\widetilde{P}_{k-2m,k} = \widetilde{P}_{k+2m,k} = 0. \end{aligned} \tag{3.6}$$

If we take the sum of the above relations for $j = k-2m+1,\dots l$, we get

$$\widetilde{P}_{l+1,k} = \sum_{j=k-2m+1}^{l}(\Delta\mathcal{V}_{j,k} - P_{k-j-1}d_{j+1}). \tag{3.7}$$

It is evident that $\widetilde{P}_{l+1,k}$ for any $\{d_j\}$ satisfy (3.5), may be except the condition $\widetilde{P}_{k+2m,k} = 0$. To satisfy this condition we need to have the equality

$$\sum_{j=k-2m+1}^{k+2m-1}(\Delta\mathcal{V}_{j,k} - P_{k-j-1}d_{j+1}) = \sum_j(\Delta\mathcal{V}_{j,k} - P_{k-j}d_j) = 0 \tag{3.8}$$

Here we can take the sum over all j, since for $|j-k|>2m-1$, $\Delta\mathcal{V}_{j,k}=P_{k-j}=0$. For $k=n-2N,\dots,n+2N$ and $j=n-N-2m,\dots,n+N+2m$ set

$$\widetilde{v}_k=\sum_{|j|\le 2m-1}\Delta\mathcal{V}_{k+j,k},\quad d_j=\sum_{|l-n|\le 2N}(\mathcal{P}^{(n-2N,n+2N)})^{-1}_{j,l}\widetilde{v}_l,. \tag{3.9}$$

Then (3.8) is evidently valid, so we find the solution of (3.6).

To prove bounds (2.37) we note that since $\mathcal{V}^*_{k+j,k}=-\mathcal{V}^*_{k-j,k}$, we have

$$|\widetilde{v}_k|\le 2m\max_{|j|\le 2m-1}|\mathcal{V}_{k+j,k}+\mathcal{V}_{k-j,k}|=2m\max_{|j|\le 2m-1}|\mathcal{V}_{k+j,k}-\mathcal{V}_{k,k-j}|\le Cm^2n^{-1}.$$

Here the last bound follows from (2.30), if we take $\mathcal{J}=\mathcal{J}^{(n)}$, define $\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}$ by its coefficients $\widetilde{J}_{k,k+1}=J^{(n)}_{k+j}$ and use (1.14) to estimate $|\widetilde{J}_{k,k+1}-J^{(n)}_k|$. Since $(\mathcal{P}^{(n-2N,n+2N)})^{-1}$ is a bounded operator with coefficients satisfying (2.29)-(2.31), from (3.9) we obtain the bounds (2.37) for $\{d_j\}$. Moreover, since (1.14) and (2.30) imply that $|\Delta\mathcal{V}_{j,k}|\le CNn^{-1}$, (3.7) yield bounds (2.37) for $\widetilde{P}_{j,k}$.

☐

Proof of Proposition 3. Integrating by parts, we obtain that for any k

$$||\epsilon\psi^{(n)}_k||_2^2=-\frac{1}{4}\int_{-L}^{L}|\lambda-\mu|\psi^{(n)}_k(\lambda)\psi^{(n)}_k(\mu)d\lambda d\mu+\left(\mathbf{1}_{|\lambda|\le L},\psi^{(n)}_k\right)_2^2 L/2 \tag{3.10}$$

with $L=2+d_1/2$. Therefore, using the Christoffel-Darboux formula, we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{n\le j\le n+N/2}&(||\epsilon\psi^{(n)}_j||_2^2+||\epsilon\psi^{(n)}_{j-1}||_2^2)\\ &\le -2\int_{-L}^{L}\Big(\left(\psi^{(n)}_{n+N/2+1}(\lambda)\psi^{(n)}_{n+N/2}(\mu)-\psi^{(n)}_{n+N/2+1}(\mu)\psi^{(n)}_{n+N/2}(\lambda)\right)J^{(n)}_{n+N/2+1}\\ &-\left(\psi^{(n)}_{n+1}(\lambda)\psi^{(n)}_n(\mu)-\psi^{(n)}_{n+1}(\mu)\psi^{(n)}_n(\lambda)\right)J^{(n)}_{n+1}\Big)\mathrm{sign}(\lambda-\mu)d\lambda d\mu+L||\mathbf{1}_{|\lambda|\le L}||_2^2\le C.\end{aligned}$$

Then, it is evident that there exists $n\le j\le n+N/2$, for which (2.46) is valid.

☐

Proof of Lemma 2. Remark first that by (2.31) $(\mathcal{R}^{(n-\widetilde{N},n+1)})^{-1}_{n,n-2i}$ in (2.49) can be replaced by $(\mathcal{R}^{(-\infty,n+1)})^{-1}_{n,n-2i}$ with the error $O(e^{-c\log^2 n})$.

Consider $P(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})\zeta^{2m-2}$ with P defined in (1.16). It is easy to see that $P(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})\zeta^{2m-2}$ is a polynomial of the $(4m-4)$-th degree, which has the roots $\{\zeta_j,\zeta_j^{-1}\}_{j=1}^{2m-2}$ with $|\zeta_j|<1$ $(j=1,\dots,2m-2)$. Denote

$$P_1(\zeta)=\prod_{j=1}^{2m-2}(\zeta-\zeta_j)=\sum_{j=0}^{2m-2}c_j\zeta^{2m-2-j},\quad P_2(\zeta)=\prod_{j=1}^{2m-2}(\zeta-\zeta_j^{-1}). \tag{3.11}$$

Then

$$P(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})=a_m\zeta^{-2m+2}P_1(\zeta)P_2(\zeta) \tag{3.12}$$

with some positive a_m. Take c_j from the representation (3.11). Using (1.19) and (3.11), we get

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{j=0}^{2m-2}R_{n-l,n-j}c_j&=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint\frac{\zeta^{-1}\sum_{j=0}^{2m-2}c_j\zeta^{l-j}d\zeta}{P(\zeta+\zeta^{-1})}\\ &=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint\frac{\zeta^{l-1}\sum_{j=0}^{2m-2}c_j\zeta^{2m-2-j}d\zeta}{a_mP_1(\zeta)P_2(\zeta)}=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint\frac{\zeta^{l-1}d\zeta}{a_mP_2(\zeta)}=\frac{\delta_{0,l}}{a_mP_2(0)}.\end{aligned}$$

Hence, we conclude that

$$(R^{(-\infty,n+1)})^{-1}_{n,n-j} = a_m P_2(0) c_j, \quad j = 0, \dots \tag{3.13}$$

In particular, we have

$$\sum_{j=0}^{2m} (R^{(-\infty,n+1)})^{-1}_{n,n-j} = a_m P_2(0) P_1(1) = (a_m P_2(0))^{1/2} (a_m P_1^2(1) P_2(0))^{1/2}.$$

Using the representation

$$P(2) = a_m P_1(1) P_2(1) = a_m \prod_{j=1}^{2m-2} (1-\zeta_i)^2 \prod_{j=1}^{2m-2} \zeta_i^{-1} = a_m P_1^2(1) P_2(0), \tag{3.14}$$

and (3.13) for $j = 1$ (recall that, according to (3.11), $c_0 = 1$), we obtain (2.49).
□

Proof of Lemma 3. Using (3.10) and (1.13), we get

$$\begin{aligned} ||\epsilon \psi_k^{(n)}||_2^2 = &-\frac{1}{2} \int_{-L}^{L} \mathrm{sign}(\lambda-\mu) (J_k^{(n)} \psi_{k+1}^{(n)}(\lambda) + J_{k-1}^{(n)} \psi_{k-1}^{(n)}(\lambda)) \psi_k^{(n)}(\mu) d\lambda d\mu \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} (\psi_k^{(n)}, \mathbf{1}_{|\lambda| \le L})^2 L = -J_k^{(n)} M_{k+1,k} - \mathcal{J}_{k-1}^{(n)} M_{k-1,k} + \frac{1}{2} (\psi_k^{(n)}, \mathbf{1}_{|\lambda| \le L})^2 L. \end{aligned} \tag{3.15}$$

Hence due to (2.18)-(2.20) we get (2.63) for odd k. Besides, integrating by parts and using that $\psi_k^{(n)} = (\epsilon \psi_k^{(n)})'$, we obtain for odd k

$$\epsilon L \psi_k^{(n)}(\lambda) = \lambda \epsilon \psi_k^{(n)}(\lambda) - \epsilon^2 \psi_k^{(n)}(\lambda),$$

where $L\psi_k(\lambda) = \lambda \psi_k(\lambda)$. Hence, using (1.13), (2.63) and the bound $||\epsilon|| \le (4+d)$, we get

$$||J_k^{(n)} \epsilon \psi_{k+1}^{(n)} + J_{k-1}^{(n)} \epsilon \psi_{k-1}^{(n)}||_2 = ||\epsilon L \psi_k^{(n)}||_2 \le C ||\epsilon \psi_k^{(n)}||_2 = O(n^{-1/2}).$$

This relation, combined with (2.45) prove (2.63) for even k.

To prove (2.64) we use the result of [7], according to which, uniformly in any compact $\Delta \subset (-2,2)$ for $|k| \le 2m+1$

$$\psi_{n+k}(\lambda) = \frac{2 + \varepsilon_{n+k}}{\sqrt{2\pi} |4-\lambda^2|^{1/4}} \cos\left(n\pi \int_\lambda^2 \rho(\mu) d\mu + k\gamma(\lambda) + \frac{1}{2}\theta(\lambda) - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) + O\left(m^2 n^{-1}\right) \tag{3.16}$$

where $\varepsilon_{n+k} \to 0$ does not depend on λ, $\rho(\lambda)$ is the limiting IDS, $\gamma(\lambda)$ is a smooth function in $(-2,2)$ and $\cos\theta = \lambda/2$.

Integrating this relations between 0 and λ, we get

$$|\epsilon \psi_{n-k}^{(n)}(\lambda) - \epsilon \psi_{n-k}^{(n)}(0)| \le C m^2 n^{-1}.$$

Then, using the fact that $(\epsilon f)(0) = 0$ for even f, we get (2.64) for even k (recall, that n is even). For odd k the above inequality imply

$$||\epsilon \psi_{n-k}^{(n)}||_2 \ge |\epsilon \psi_{n-k}^{(n)}(0)| + C m^2 n^{-1}.$$

Combining with (2.63), we get (2.64).

Inequality (2.65) follows from the result [13] (see Lemma 7), according to which

$$\Big|\Big(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_1}+\frac{\partial}{\partial s_2}\Big)K_{n,2}(\lambda_0+s_1/n,\lambda_0+s_2/n)\Big|\le C\Big(n^{-1}|s_1-s_2|^2$$
$$+|\psi_n^{(n)}(\lambda_0+s_1/n)|^2+|\psi_{n-1}^{(n)}(\lambda_0+s_1/n)|^2+|\psi_n^{(n)}(\lambda_0+s_2/n)|^2+|\psi_{n-1}^{(n)}(\lambda_0+s_2/n)|^2\Big).$$

Since by(3.16) $\psi_n^{(n)}$, $\psi_{n-1}^{(n)}$ are uniformly bounded in each compact $\mathbb{K}\subset(-2,2)$, we obtain (2.66).

To prove (2.66) we use the Christoffel-Darboux formula, which gives us

$$n^{-1}IK_{n,2}(\lambda,\mu)=\int_{|\lambda'-\lambda_0|\ge\delta'}\epsilon(\lambda-\lambda')\frac{\psi_n^{(n)}(\lambda')\psi_{n-1}^{(n)}(\mu)-\psi_{n-1}^{(n)}(\lambda')\psi_n^{(n)}(\mu)}{\lambda'-\mu}d\lambda'$$
$$+\int_{|\lambda'-\lambda_0|\le\delta'}\epsilon(\lambda-\lambda')\frac{\psi_n^{(n)}(\lambda')\psi_{n-1}^{(n)}(\mu)-\psi_{n-1}^{(n)}(\lambda')\psi_n^{(n)}(\mu)}{\lambda'-\mu}d\lambda'=I_1+I_2 \quad (3.17)$$

Integrating by parts (we use again that $\psi_k^{(n)}=(\epsilon\psi_k^{(n)})')$ and taking into account that $\epsilon\psi_k^{(n)}(\pm L)=\pm(\epsilon\psi_k^{(n)},\mathbf{1}_{|\lambda|\le L})=O(n^{-1/2})$ (see (3.15) and (2.63)), we get

$$|I_1|\le C\delta^{-1}n^{-1/2}+\delta^{-2}\int_{-L}^{L}(|\epsilon\psi_n^{(n)}(\lambda')|+|\epsilon\psi_{n-1}^{(n)}(\lambda')|)d\lambda'$$
$$\le C\delta^{-1}n^{-1/2}+C\delta^{-2}(||\epsilon\psi_{n-1}^{(n)}||_2+||\epsilon\psi_n^{(n)}||_2)=O(n^{-1/2}).$$

To find I_2 observe that (3.16) yields for $\lambda,\mu\in(-2+\varepsilon,2-\varepsilon)$

$$n^{-1}K_{n,2}(\lambda,\mu)=R(\lambda)\frac{\sin\Big(n\pi\int_\mu^\lambda\rho(\lambda')d\lambda'\Big)}{n(\lambda-\mu)}(1+(\lambda-\mu)\phi_1(\lambda,\mu))$$
$$+n^{-1}\cos\Big(n\pi\int_\mu^\lambda\rho(\lambda')d\lambda'\Big)\phi_2(\lambda,\mu)+n^{-1}\cos\Big(n\pi(\int_2^\lambda+\int_2^\mu)\rho(\lambda')d\lambda'\Big)\phi_3(\lambda,\mu),$$

where R and ϕ_1,ϕ_2,ϕ_3 are smooth functions of λ. Hence, using the Riemann-Lebesgue theorem to estimate integrals with $\phi_i(\lambda,\mu)$, we obtain

$$I_2=\int_{-n\delta'}^{n\delta'}ds'\epsilon(s_1-s')R(\lambda_0+s'/n)\frac{\sin\Big(n\pi\int_{\lambda_0+s_2/n}^{\lambda_0+s'/n}\rho(\lambda')d\lambda'\Big)}{s'-s_2}+o(1).$$

Now we split here the integration domain in two parts: $|s'|\le A$ and $|s'|\ge A$ and take the limits $n\to\infty$ and then $A\to\infty$. Relation (2.66) follows.

□

Proof of Proposition 2. Assertion (i) follows from the spectral theorem, according to which

$$Q(\mathcal{J})_{j,k}=\frac{1}{2\pi i}\oint_{d(z)=d}R_{j,k}(z)Q^{-1}(z)dz, \quad (3.18)$$

and the bound, valid for the resolvent $R(z)=(\mathcal{J}-z)^{-1}$ of any Jacobi matrix $\mathcal{J}$, satisfying conditions of the proposition (see [16])

$$|R_{a,b}|\le\frac{C}{d(z)}e^{-Cd(z)|a-b|},\quad d(z)=\operatorname{dist}\{z,[-2-d_1/2,2+d_1/2]\}. \quad (3.19)$$

To prove assertion (ii) consider

$$\mathcal{J}(n_1,n_2)=\mathcal{J}^{(n_1,n_2)}+\mathcal{J}^{(-\infty,n_1)}+\mathcal{J}^{(n_2,\infty)},\quad \widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(n_1,n_2)=\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}^{(n_1,n_2)}+\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}^{(-\infty,n_1)}+\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}^{(n_2,\infty)}$$

and denote

$$R^{(1)}(z)=(\mathcal{J}(n_1,n_2)-z)^{-1},\quad R^{(2)}(z)=(\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}(n_1,n_2)-z)^{-1},\quad \widetilde{R}(z)=(\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}-z)^{-1}.$$

It is evident that for $n_1\le j,k\le n_2$ and $z\notin[-2,2]$

$$R^{(1)}_{j,k}(z)=(\mathcal{J}^{(n_1,n_2)}-z)^{-1}_{j,k},\quad R^{(2)}_{j,k}(z)=(\widetilde{\mathcal{J}}^{(n_1,n_2)}-z)^{-1}_{j,k}.$$

Then, using the resolvent identity (2.43) and (3.19, we get

$$|R^{(1)}_{j,k}(z)-R^{(2)}_{j,k}(z)|\le C\sup_{i\in[n_1,n_2)}|J_{i,i+1}-\widetilde{J}_{i,i+1}|\frac{e^{-d(z)|j-k|/2}}{d^2(z)}.$$

On the other hand, by (2.43) and (3.19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}|R_{j,k}-R^{(1)}_{j,k}|&\le|R_{j,n_1+1}R^{(1)}_{n_1,k}|+|R_{j,n_1}R^{(1)}_{n_1+1,k}|+|R_{j,n_2}R^{(1)}_{n_2-1,k}|+|R_{j,n_2-1}R^{(1)}_{n_2,k}|\\&\le\frac{C}{d^2(z)}(e^{-d(z)(|n_1-j|+|n_1-k|)}+e^{-d(z)(|n_2-j|+|n_2-k|)}).\end{aligned}$$

Similar bound is valid for $|\widetilde{R}_{j,k}-R^{(2)}_{j,k}|$. Then (3.19) and (3.18) yield (2.30).

To prove assertion (iii) observe that $x_j=(Q(\mathcal{J})^{(n_1,n_2)})^{-1}_{j,k}$ is the solution of the infinite linear system:

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum Q(\mathcal{J})_{i,j}x_j=\delta_{i,k}, && i\in[n_1,n_2)\\&\sum Q(\mathcal{J})_{i,j}x_j=r_i:=\sum Q(\mathcal{J})_{i,j}(Q(\mathcal{J})^{(n_1,n_2)})^{-1}_{j,k}, && i\notin[n_1,n_2).\end{aligned}$$

Hence,

$$(Q(\mathcal{J})^{(n_1,n_2)})^{-1}_{j,k}=Q^{-1}(\mathcal{J})_{j,k}+\sum_{i\notin[n_1,n_2)}Q^{-1}(\mathcal{J})_{j,i}r_i$$

Now, using assertion (i), we obtain the first inequality in (2.31). For the second the proof is the same.

Acknowledgements. The author is grateful to Prof. L.Pastur for the fruitful discussion. The author acknowledges also the INTAS Research Network 03-51-6637 for the financial support.

References

[1] Albeverio, S., Pastur, L., Shcherbina, M.: On Asymptotic Properties of the Jacobi Matrix Coefficients. Matem. Fizika, Analiz, Geometriya **4**, 263-277 (1997)

[2] Albeverio, S., Pastur, L., Shcherbina, M.: On the $1/n$ expansion for some unitary invariant ensembles of random matrices. Commun. Math. Phys. **224**, 271-305 (2001)

[3] Boutet de Monvel, A., Pastur L., Shcherbina M.: On the statistical mechanics approach in the random matrix theory. Integrated density of states. J. Stat. Phys. **79**, 585-611 (1995)

[4] Claeys, T., Kuijalaars, A.B.J.: Universality of the double scaling limit in random matrix models, preprint arXiv:math-ph/0501074

[5] Deift, P., Kriecherbauer,,T., McLaughlin,K. T.- R.: New results on the equilibrium measure for logarithmic potentials in the presence of an external field, J. Approx. Theory **95**, 388–475 (1998)

[6] Deift, P., Kriecherbauer, T., McLaughlin, K., Venakides, S., Zhou, X.: Uniform asymptotics for polynomials orthogonal with respect to varying exponential weights and applications to universality questions in random matrix theory. Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **52**, 1335-1425 (1999)

[7] Deift, P., Kriecherbauer, T., McLaughlin, K., Venakides, S., Zhou, X.: Strong asymptotics of orthogonal polynomials with respect to exponential weights. Commun. Pure Appl. Math. **52**, 1491-1552 (1999)

[8] Deift, P., Gioev, D.: Universality in random matrix theory for orthogonal and symplectic ensembles. Preprint arxiv:math-ph/0411075

[9] Deift, P., Gioev, D.: Universality at the edge of the spectrum for unitary, orthogonal, and symplectic ensembles of random matrices Preprint arxiv:math-ph/0507023

[10] Dyson, D.J.: A Class of Matrix Ensembles. J.Math.Phys.,**13**, 90-107 (1972)

[11] Johansson, K.: On fluctuations of eigenvalues of random Hermitian matrices. Duke Math. J. **91**, 151-204 (1998)

[12] M.L.Mehta, M.L.: *Random Matrices.* New York: Academic Press, 1991

[13] Pastur, L., Shcherbina, M.: Universality of the local eigenvalue statistics for a class of unitary invariant random matrix ensembles. *J. Stat. Phys.* **86**, 109-147 (1997)

[14] Pastur, L., Shcherbina, M.:On the edge universality of the local eigenvalue statistics of matrix models. Matematicheskaya fizika, analiz, geometriya **10**, N3, 335-365 (2003)

[15] Pastur, L., Shcherbina, M.: Bulk universality and related properties of Hermitian matrix models (in preparation)

[16] Reed,M., Simon,B.:*Methods of Modern Mathematical Physics, Vol.IV*, Academic Press: New York, 1978

[17] Saff, E., Totik, V.: *Logarithmic Potentials with External Fields.* Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1997

[18] Shcherbina,M.: Double scaling limit for matrix models with non analytic potentials. Preprint ArXiv:cond-mat/0511161

[19] Stojanovic, A.: Universality in orthogonal and symplectic invariant matrix models with quatric potentials. Math.Phys.Anal.Geom. **3**, 339-373 (2002)

[20] Stojanovic, A.: Universalité pour des modéles orthogonale ou symplectiqua et a potentiel quartic. Math.Phys.Anal.Geom. Preprint Bibos 02-07-98

[21] C.A. Tracy, H. Widom: Correlation functions, cluster functions, and spacing distributions for random matrices. J.Stat.Phys. **92**, 809-835 (1998)